An Examination of Iowa State Patrol Traffic Stops 10/00-3/02

This report was prepared by the

Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning

for the

Iowa Department of Public Safety

Iowa State Patrol

April 2003

http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/cjjp

INTRODUCTION

This report describes traffic law enforcement data collected by the Iowa State Patrol (ISP) related to traffic stops made by Troopers from October 1, 2000 through March 30, 2002. The data contained in this report summarizes the activities of approximately 435 troopers who are assigned to 15 Posts throughout the State of Iowa. The purpose of this voluntary data collection process was to provide the ISP with the ability to review traffic law enforcement variables in relation to traffic stops. The methodology for this research project was developed and implemented by ISP. Following the data collection period, the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) was asked to assist in the analysis and reporting phase of this ambitious project.

Nationally, there have been concerns about possible racial profiling by law enforcement agencies. For this reason, ISP asked CJJP to prepare this report in a way that would provide for an examination of relationships among driver race/ethnicity and other traffic stop study variables. It should be made clear at the outset of this report that the data it contains do not provide clear or statistically significant evidence for or against the existence of racial profiling. The collection and reporting of traffic stop information is a challenge that law enforcement agencies across the country are working to perfect. As has been the case in other such studies, the number of reported ISP trooper contacts with persons of unknown or unreported race or ethnic backgrounds was problematic, as were other data shortcomings. ISP began this research prior to the availability of a number of valuable resources recently issued to assist law enforcement agencies and others attempting to respond to racial profiling or the perceptions of its practice. Some of these resources are cited in the conclusion of this report and are recommended reading for anyone interested in improving their understanding of police-public contacts and the difficulties faced when considering such contacts together with the issue of race and ethnicity. Despite what it is not, the data in this report should be viewed as a major contribution to future efforts of ISP or others to critically review traffic law enforcement practices.

Table 1: Number of Stops by Race

Race	Total	
	N	%
African Amer	6624	2.5%
Asian	2578	1.0%
Caucasian	230282	88.2%
Hispanic/Latino	7716	3.0%
Native Amer	460	0.2%
Other	1587	0.6%
Unknown	11854	4.5%
Total	261101	100

Table 1 describes the race/ethnicity of those people stopped by ISP troopers during the study period. The data in this table also demonstrate one of the fundamental problems inherent in most studies of racial profiling; that being the number of people stopped whose race was not recorded by or known to the person collecting the data. The growing body of research in this area seems to have done little to build consensus on how to

address this problem. Should the law enforcement officer be expected to ask the person to identify his or her race and then rely on that answer? Should people be expected to respond if asked to identify his or her race? Or, should the officer determine the person's race based on their own opinion? Or, should the law enforcement officer only record race when some government-issued identification document identifies the person's race? How should people who consider themselves to be of mixed races or ethnic backgrounds be counted? How should the "unknowns" be addressed in the analysis and reporting of the data?

While discussions of the above questions seem to quickly become complicated, one problem from a research perspective is the extent to which the number of "unknowns" affects how data such as that included in Table 1 and throughout this report can be interpreted. When the number of "unknowns" exceeds the number in each race category save Caucasian, conclusions are difficult to draw and perhaps should not be attempted. This problem is not unique to this Iowa study but may be particularly troublesome here given the comparatively small number of persons in Iowa that are not Caucasians.

The choosing of analyses techniques with which to "measure" racial profiling data also is problematic. Lets say we want to know whether or not a finding that some presence of racial profiling is indicated when 2.5% of all traffic stops are of a certain race. If people of that race make up 2.5% or more of the general population, then one might conclude that profiling is not occurring. However, should the driving-age population be the denominator in the analysis equation, or should we seek more meaningful denominators such as the number of all licensed motor vehicle drivers within given race/ethnicity categories or, even better, the numbers of people within given race/ethnicity categories that were in fact using the actual roadways when and where the recorded stops were made? Neither of these options was available for ISP to consider as this research was being planned. The Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) collects race data when processing requests for drivers' licenses (although it does not print it on the license), but the percent of people the DOT records as being of "unknown" or "other" race exceeds the four and a half percent reported in Table 1 above. While researchers in other parts of the country have attempted to monitor the race of people actually using a given roadway, such research is typically limited to only a few stretches of certain roadways and has had to rely on the observations or opinions of research staff attempting to determine the race of drivers they see or otherwise survey.

An additional difficulty with comparing the numbers of people stopped with some larger population is that not all drivers on a certain roadway are from the area containing that roadway. Many drivers on Iowa's highways are visiting or traveling through the state from all parts of the nation. Using only Iowa population data does not provide a complete or accurate picture of who is on Iowa's roadways and thus potentially "eligible" for a traffic stop. Despite such research obstacles, states, cities and law enforcement agencies throughout the country have been collecting data on traffic stops in their effort to shed light on concerns over the perception or reality of racial profiling. Methods for the analyses that follow are consistent with much of the research reports being issued by others. Because of the fundamental methodological shortcomings outlined above, however, great caution should be used in drawing any conclusions from these data regarding the extent to which racial profiling did or did not occur. Consistent with the motives of ISP in collecting the data, however, this report was prepared with the hope that it will help guide proactive discussions of racial profiling in Iowa.

RACE OF STOPPED DRIVERS AND RACE OF GENERAL POPULATION

Table 2, below, reports the number of stopped drivers, their reported race and whether or not they were driving a vehicle registered in Iowa. Table 3 provides a comparison of the numbers of stopped drivers of different races in vehicles with Iowa vehicle registrations with the number of people of such races aged sixteen or older (persons 16 and older can acquire drivers' licenses in Iowa) within the general population of Iowa. Table 4 provides a comparison of the numbers of stopped drivers of different races in vehicles with other than Iowa vehicle registrations with the number of people of such races aged sixteen or older within the general population of the U.S.

Table 2: Cross Tabulation of Race by Place of Vehicle Registration

Race	Unknown		Iowa		Non-Iowa		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%*
African Amer	329	5.0	3276	49.5	3019	45.6	6624	100.1
Asian	154	6.0	1622	62.9	802	31.1	2578	100.0
Caucasian	9868	4.3	177424	77.1	42990	18.7	230282	100.1
Hispanic/Latino	448	5.8	4315	55.9	2953	38.3	7716	100.0
Native Amer	37	8.0	188	40.9	235	51.1	460	100.0
Other	96	6.1	822	51.8	669	42.2	1587	100.1
Unknown	6302	53.2	4540	38.3	1012	8.5	11854	100.0
Total	17234	6.6	192187	73.6	51680	19.8	261101	100.0

*May not total 100% due to rounding

As was discussed in the Introduction of this report, caution is urged when attempting to draw conclusions from the data in Tables 2, 3 and 4. As can be seen in Table 2, for many (11,854) of these cases, the race of the driver was not reported, and for over half (53.2%) of these unknown-race drivers, it also was unknown whether their vehicle was registered in Iowa or elsewhere.

Table 3: Cases Where Race and Registration Are Known, and Only Iowa Vehicles are Considered

RACE	% RACE CONTACTED	IA CENSUS POPULATION*
African American	1.7%	1.8%
Asian	0.9%	1.2%
Caucasian	94.6%	95.0%
Hispanic/Latino	2.3%	2.3%
Native American	0.1%	0.3%
Other	0.4%	1.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	102.3%

Note: Total population of Iowa residents 16 years of age or older. Census population exceeds 100% due to rounding and because the Hispanic/Latino population is calculated by the U.S. Census Bureau as a category separate from race.

Data in Table 3 would seem to indicate that all people driving vehicles registered in Iowa were similarly likely to be stopped by the ISP regardless of their race or ethnic background. The percent of all stops that any given race/ethnic group accounts for is equal to or less than its percent of the general population of driving-aged people. Based on the data in Table 4, similar statements might be made regarding all people other than

Caucasians who are driving in Iowa while in vehicles registered in places other than Iowa.

Table 4: Cases Where Race and Registration Are Known, and Only Non-Iowa Vehicles are Considered

RACE	% RACE CONTACTED	U.S. CENSUS POPULATION*
African American	6.0%	11.5%
Asian	1.6%	3.7%
Caucasian	84.8%	77.1%
Hispanic/Latino	5.8%	11.1%
Native American	0.5%	0.8%
Other	1.3%	6.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	112.4%

Note: Estimate of total population of U.S. residents 16 years of age or older. Total population exceeds 100% because the Hispanic/Latino population is calculated by the U.S. Census Bureau as a category separate from race. "Other" includes multi-race persons among others.

REASON FOR TRAFFIC STOPS

As will be seen in the following two tables, the vast majority of traffic stops reported by the ISP troopers were for traffic-related reasons. Despite the number of "unknown" reasons-for-stops and race cases, the data in tables 5 and 6 may indicate that while people of all races were usually stopped for an alleged traffic offense, Caucasians are the most likely to be stopped for such a reason. Hispanic/Latinos may have been more likely than the other groups to have been stopped for equipment violations, while African Americans, Native Americans and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Hispanic/Latinos may have been more likely than the other groups to have experienced contacts by troopers offering roadside assistance. The data indicate little difference among the races regarding traffic stops initiated as a result of complaints or inquires by the public or as a result of perceived threats to community safety other than traffic or equipment violations. It can also be noted in Table 5 that the reason for contact was "unknown" for Native Americans at almost double the rate as for some of the other groups.

Table 5: Cross Tabulation of Variables Race and Reason for Contact

Race	Unk		Pub Ast		Equip		Other		Pub Init		Com Sft		Traffic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Amer	388	5.9	535	8.1	440	6.6	81	1.2	49	0.7	2	<.1	5129	77.4
Asian	179	6.9	151	5.9	168	6.5	36	1.4	17	0.7	4	0.2	2023	78.5
Cauc	15301	6.6	9491	4.1	16854	7.3	2153	0.9	957	0.4	332	0.1	185194	80.4
Hisp/Latino	544	7.1	531	6.9	731	9.5	104	1.3	34	0.4	12	0.2	5760	74.7
Nat Amr	53	11.5	33	7.2	31	6.7	5	1.1	1	0.2	0	0.0	337	73.3
Other	97	6.1	70	4.4	124	7.8	23	1.4	13	0.8	3	0.2	1257	79.2
Unknown	6502	54.9	210	1.8	469	4.0	57	0.5	28	0.2	19	0.2	4569	38.5
Total	23064	8.8	11021	4.2	18817	7.2	2459	0.9	1099	0.4	372	0.1	204269	78.2

Table 6: Contact Reason by Race When Valid Values for Both Variables Were Present

Race	Pub Assist		Equipment		Other		Public Init		Com Sfty		Traffic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Am	535	8.6	440	7.1	81	1.3	49	0.8	2	<.1	5129	82.2
Asian	151	6.3	168	7.0	36	1.5	17	0.7	4	0.2	2023	84.3
Cauc	9491	4.4	16854	7.8	2153	1.0	957	0.4	332	0.2	185194	86.1
Hisp/Latino	531	7.4	731	10.2	104	1.5	34	0.5	12	0.2	5760	80.3
Nat Am	33	8.1	31	7.6	5	1.2	1	0.2	0	0.0	337	82.8
Other	70	4.7	124	8.3	23	1.5	13	0.9	3	0.2	1257	84.4
Total	10811	4.6	18348	7.9	2402	1.0	1071	0.5	353	0.2	199700	85.5

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

CONTACT OUTCOMES

Many studies of race and police contact consider the outcome of the contact to be a significant study variable. As has been true for other study variables discussed in this report, there were a substantial number of cases for which the contact outcome was unknown (see Table 7). And, as was true for the reason-for-contact variable, the greatest number of unknown outcomes was in cases where the race of the driver was also unknown. As a result, caution should be used when attempting to draw conclusions. The data in Tables 7 and 8 may indicate, however, that Caucasians were the most likely to have received a warning and among the least likely to have been arrested or issued a citation following the stop. Also, the data seem to indicate that African Americans, Hispanic/Latinos and Native Americans were more likely than were the other groups to have been arrested as a result of the contact.

Table 7: Cross Tabulation of Variables Race and Contact Outcome

Race	Arrest		Citation		No Action		Warning		Unknown		TOTAL *	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Amr	238	3.6	3747	56.6	723	10.9	1418	21.4	498	7.5	6624	100.0
Asian	28	1.1	1429	55.4	231	9.0	710	27.5	180	7.0	2578	100.0
Cauc	2674	1.2	119399	51.8	14018	6.1	77397	33.6	16794	7.3	230282	100.0
Hisp/Latino	241	3.1	4253	55.1	713	9.2	1881	24.4	628	8.1	7716	99.9
Nat Amr	15	3.3	241	52.4	38	8.3	122	26.5	44	9.6	460	100.1
Other	18	1.1	951	59.9	118	7.4	394	24.8	106	6.7	1587	99.9
Unknown	60	0.5	3473	29.3	366	3.1	2585	21.8	5370	45.3	11854	100.0
Total	3274	1.3	133493	51.1	16207	6.2	84507	32.4	23620	9.0	261101	100.0

* May not total 100% due to rounding

It is important to understand that these data do not describe all information known to the troopers or the actual behavior of any of the drivers or their passengers prior to or during the contact. More information describing such variables as the existence of outstanding warrants or the severity of traffic violations, for example, would be needed to gain a more complete understanding of the reasons for differences in contact outcomes. (See Appendix A for more data on contact outcomes)

Table 8: Contact Outcome by Race When Valid Values for Both Variables Were Present

RACE	ARREST		CITATION		NO ACTION		WARNING		TOTAL *	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Amr	238	3.9	3747	61.2	723	11.8	1418	23.1	6126	100.0
Asian	28	1.2	1429	59.6	231	9.6	710	29.6	2398	100.0
Cauc	2674	1.3	119399	55.9	14018	6.6	77397	36.3	213488	100.1
Hispanic/Latino	241	3.4	4253	60.0	713	10.1	1881	26.5	7088	100.0
Nat Amr	15	3.6	241	57.9	38	9.1	122	29.3	416	99.9
Other	18	1.2	951	64.2	118	8.0	394	26.6	1481	100.0
TOTAL	3214	1.4	130020	56.3	15841	6.9	81922	35.5	230997	100.1

* May not total 100% due to rounding

SEARCHES

Whether or not a search is conducted following the initial contact may depend on many variables including, but not limited to, the existence of warrants for the person stopped, visible contraband, suspicious behavior of the driver or passengers or other seemingly incriminating evidence regarding the vehicle or the people in it. Following a determination of probable cause or in the course of an arrest, law enforcement officials will likely conduct searches. In some cases, drivers may be asked to voluntarily submit to a search; in others cases they may be given no choice. The decisions by the law enforcement officer to request or conduct searches is, to a great extent, up to the discretion of the officer, as is the decision made earlier in the case to initiate the contact. These two study variables – decision to make contact and decision to request or conduct a search – are probably the variables most often considered when examining the extent to which racial profiling may be occurring.

Table 9: Cross Tabulation of Searches Conducted by Race

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total *	
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
African Amer	473	7.1	6059	91.5	92	1.5	6624	100.1
Asian	78	3.0	2478	96.1	22	0.9	2578	100.0
Caucasian	6170	2.7	221590	96.2	2522	1.1	230282	100.0
Hispanic/Latino	793	10.3	6842	88.7	81	1.0	7716	100.0
Native Amer	28	6.0	423	92.0	9	2.0	460	100.0
Other	58	3.7	1512	95.3	17	1.0	1587	100.0
Unknown	191	1.6	10804	91.1	859	7.3	11854	100.0
Total	7791	3.0	249708	95.6	3602	1.4	261101	100

* May not total 100% because of rounding

Table 10: Searches Conducted by Race Where Valid Values for Both Variables are Present

Race	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
African American	473	7.2	6059	92.8	6532	100
Asian	78	3.1	2478	96.9	2556	100
Caucasian	6170	2.7	221590	97.3	227760	100
Hispanic/Latino	793	10.4	6842	89.6	7635	100
Native American	28	6.2	423	93.8	451	100
Other	58	3.7	1512	96.3	1570	100
TOTAL	7600	3.1	238904	96.9	246504	100

One of the clearer findings from this research may be that it appears relatively few people stopped by the ISP are being searched. As can be seen in Table 9, out of the 261,101 contacts only 7,791 searches (or 3% of all contacts) were reported. This averages out to about 433 searches per month and, based on cases with known variables, these would have involved about 343 Caucasians, 44 Hispanic/Latinos, 26 African Americans, and less that six Asians and Native Americans being searched each month. If it were assumed that searches were conducted in all the cases where it was unknown whether a search was conducted, only about 4.4% of all persons contacted would have been searched.

The ability to look across races with this study variable is again compromised by the number of cases with "unknown" data. However, in those cases where values for both the race and the search variables were known, Hispanic/Latinos were the most likely to be searched, followed by African Americans and Native Americans. In fact, the data in Table 10 indicate that in the cases with known variables, people of these races/ethnicities were more than twice as likely to be searched than were Caucasians or Asians. This finding, alone, does not necessarily mean that race or ethnic background was the reason for such a difference. Additional information regarding the reason for the search would be needed before the effect of race could be statistically "isolated" from other possible decision-to-search influences such as the existence of an outstanding warrant for the driver, the presence of visible contraband or the behavior of the vehicle' passengers before and after the stop.

CONTRABAND SEIZED

Contraband, including weapons, drugs, alcohol and currency, was seized in about forty percent of the 7,791 cases in which a search was conducted and reported by the ISP troopers. Table 11 shows how this percentage varies among racial and ethnic groups. It is of some interest to note that while Caucasians may have been the least likely to be searched (see Tables 9 and 10), the searches of Caucasians were the most likely to have found contraband (see Table 11). In contrast, while Hispanic/Latinos may have been the most likely to be searched, contraband was found in a significantly smaller percentage of their cases than was true for Caucasians or African Americans.

Table 11: All Searches Conducted by Race and Contraband Found When Valid Values Were Present for Search and Contraband Found Variables

Race	Searched	Contraband Found	% Found Posses Contraband
African Amer	473	189	40.0
Asian	78	18	23.1
Caucasian	6170	2628	42.6
Hispanic/Latino	793	217	27.4
Native Amer	28	7	25.0
Other	58	15	25.9
Unknown	191	56	29.3
Total	7791	3130	40.2

If the finding of contraband is ever thought of as a justification of a given search, these data would seem to indicate that the ISP searches of Caucasians and, to a somewhat lesser degree, of African Americans were more justified by the search results than were the searches of people in the other racial or ethnic groups. On the other hand, if the lack of contraband being found is an indication that the search was unnecessary, these data would seem to indicate that Asians, Native Americans and Hispanic/Latinos were more likely to be unnecessarily searched than were Caucasians or African Americans. It may also be that neither of these conclusions is appropriate. Rather, it may be that decisions-to-search influences such as those suggested above may have been present more often in those cases where contraband was found than in those cases where no contraband was found. (see Appendices B and C for more data on searches conducted).

CONCLUSIONS

Can we say whether or not ISP troopers are stopping, ticketing, searching or arresting people differently because of their race? The data in this report do not conclusively answer this question. They do give us an indication that Iowans are not more or less likely to be stopped by ISP troopers because of their race. This observation is only an indication, however, because we do not know the race or ethnicity of all stopped motorists, nor do we know the true racial/ethnic make-up of the population of motorists on ISP patrolled roads.

The data in this report also do not definitively answer the question of whether or not the ISP troopers are influenced by a person's race or ethnicity when deciding whether to conduct a search or issue a warning vs. a formal sanction. The data do seem to indicate that race or ethnicity may have sometimes influenced decisions in these areas. However, such observations are only indications because a substantial number of cases had missing data and because the impact of numerous other variables that should affect such decisions is unknown (e.g. existence of outstanding warrants, severity of alleged traffic violations, visible contraband, incriminating driver or passenger behavior).

Across the nation, racial profiling is a complex, controversial and sometimes emotional topic. Few, if any, examples exist from which to pattern a resolution of this issue that satisfies everyone. ISP should be commended for initiating this research project. ISP's

decision to use its resources to collect and share these data was made without the pressure of a legal mandate that has been deemed necessary in other states and jurisdictions. ISP's effort should be acknowledged and considered a success in that it is has resulted in the presentation of data with which thoughtful and proactive discussions and activities can be promoted and guided.

There are shortcomings with the completeness of the data collected in this research. Most social science research has this problem. Some racial profiling studies do not report such unknown data and draw conclusions as if the data were complete. ISP was aware of other such studies and did not suggest other than a full reporting of findings. That is to their credit. Some of the data shortcomings (e.g. number of cases where "race/ethnicity" is unknown) may never be completely avoided. Other problems with missing data (e.g. contact outcomes, searches conducted) could have perhaps been reduced with structured data collection audits and ongoing reporting compliance checks by supervisors or through periodic comparisons of this data with data from other ISP data systems. A more proactive solution might be one that involves a review of existing ISP data collection activities that could be altered to include the ongoing collection of data items of relevance to questions related to racial profiling.

Since ISP designed the methodology for this study, many other such studies have been initiated in other jurisdictions. While the scope and sophistication of ISP's research plans exceeded many of these other studies, there is now a growing body of guidance and "lessons-learned" materials that, had it been available, would have been helpful to ISP in the design and implementation of its data collection activities.

Two reports issued by the federal government in particular are recommended for consideration by ISP or anyone else who may be contemplating the initiation or improvement of police-citizen contact research. The first of these, *"A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data "Collection Systems – Promising Practices and Lessons Learned"* was issued by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2000 (http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/bja/184768.pdf). A more recent report, *"How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data: Your Reputation Depends on it!"* was issued by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services in 2002 (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Open=True&Item=770).

Also, it is highly recommended that anyone reading this ISP data report to look for evidence for or against the existence of racial profiling should also read the above-cited reports. Both reports attempt a balanced discussion of the many issues comprising the concept of racial profiling. Both explain why it is important for law enforcement officials to actively identify and eliminate racial profiling practices. They also both explain why it is equally important for law enforcement officials to actively seek ways to respond to law-abiding people's perceptions that racial profiling is occurring. Similarly, both reports recognize the need for a better understanding of how law enforcement agencies are expected by the public to engage in proactive, not just reactive, investigative activities to keep our streets, highways and neighborhoods as safe as they can. Also described in these reports are a variety of methodological issues and research shortcomings to be aware of when reviewing data such as has been provided by the ISP through this report.

Other resources exist that also could aid ISP and others' efforts to better understand and address racial profiling perceptions and practices:

"Characteristics of Drivers Stopped by Police, 1999" issued March 2002 by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Based on a survey of the general public, this report provides data on the nature and characteristics of traffic stops. Tables present detailed demographic characteristics of the 19.3 million drivers stopped by police in 1999. Drivers stopped one time over a 12-month period and drivers stopped two or more times are compared across categories of gender, age, and race/ethnicity. The report also examines driver responses regarding the traffic stop, speeding, searches conducted by police, arrest, and use of force. http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cdsp99.htm

"Traffic Stop Data Collection Policies for State Police, 2001" issued December 2001 by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. This report presents findings from the 2001 State Police Traffic Stop Data Collection Procedures. State police agencies were asked to report on their policies and procedures for collecting race and ethnicity data regarding motorists involved in traffic stops. Discussed are the circumstances under which demographic data are collected for traffic-related contacts and violations.
http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/tsdcp01.htm

"Racially Biased Policing: A Principled Response" issued in 2001 by the Police Executive Research Forum. This report provides guidance to police agencies responding to racial profiling and the perceptions of its practice. The report is based on a survey of more than 1,000 agency executives; materials from more than 250 agencies; focus groups; a literature review; advice from subject-matter experts; and an Advisory Board composed of law enforcement agency executives, Justice Department personnel, community activists, and civil rights leaders. http://www.policeforum.org/racial.html

APPENDIX A **CONTACT OUTCOMES BY RACE AND BY ROAD TYPE**

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race &	Arrest		Citation		No Action		Warning		Unknown		Total
Road Type	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Afr Amer (I)	119	3.4%	2008	56.9%	496	14.1%	679	19.2%	226	6.4%	3528
Afr Amer (O)	111	4.1%	1541	56.3%	204	7.5%	667	24.4%	212	7.8%	2735
Afr Amer (U)	8	2.2%	198	54.8%	23	6.4%	72	19.9%	60	16.6%	361
Asian (I)	10	0.9%	659	59.4%	142	12.8%	244	22.0%	55	5.0%	1110
Asian (O)	18	1.4%	693	52.9%	85	6.5%	417	31.9%	96	7.3%	1309
Asian (U)	0	0.0%	77	48.4%	4	2.5%	49	30.8%	29	18.2%	159
Caucasian (I)	506	1.1%	26004	54.8%	6786	14.3%	11442	24.1%	2732	5.8%	47470
Caucasian (O)	2021	1.2%	87074	51.4%	6656	3.9%	61671	36.4%	12073	7.1%	169495
Caucasian (U)	147	1.1%	6321	47.5%	576	4.3%	4284	32.2%	1989	14.9%	13317
Hisp/Latino (I)	98	3.2%	1546	50.3%	440	14.3%	799	26.0%	190	6.2%	3073
Hisp/Latino (O)	124	3.0%	2444	59.5%	242	5.9%	941	22.9%	354	8.6%	4105
Hips/Latino (U)	19	3.5%	263	48.9%	31	5.8%	141	26.2%	84	15.6%	538
Native Amer (I)	4	2.1%	103	52.8%	27	13.8%	46	23.6%	15	7.7%	195
Native Amer (O)	9	4.2%	115	53.2%	10	4.6%	61	28.2%	21	9.7%	216
Native Amer (U)	2	4.1%	23	46.9%	1	2.0%	15	30.6%	8	16.3%	49
Other (I)	10	1.4%	441	60.8%	73	10.1%	152	21.0%	49	6.8%	725
Other (O)	7	0.9%	451	59.0%	40	5.2%	222	29.1%	44	5.8%	764
Other (U)	1	1.0%	59	60.2%	5	5.1%	20	20.4%	13	13.3%	98
Unknown (I)	10	0.9%	565	48.2%	147	12.5%	318	27.1%	132	11.3%	1172
Unknown (O)	32	0.8%	1905	47.4%	144	3.6%	1427	35.5%	507	12.6%	4015
Unknown (U)	18	0.3%	1003	15.0%	75	1.1%	840	12.6%	4731	71.0%	6667
TOTAL	3274	1.3%	133493	51.1%	16207	6.2%	84507	32.4%	23620	9.0%	261101

Race &	Arrest		Citation		No Action		Warning		Total
Road Type*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Afr Amer (I)	119	3.6%	2008	60.8%	496	15.0%	679	20.6%	3302
Afr Amer (O)	111	4.4%	1541	61.1%	204	8.1%	667	26.4%	2523
Asian (I)	10	0.9%	659	62.5%	142	13.5%	244	23.1%	1055
Asian (O)	18	1.5%	693	57.1%	85	7.0%	417	34.4%	1213
Caucasian (I)	506	1.1%	26004	58.1%	6786	15.2%	11442	25.6%	44738
Caucasian (O)	2021	1.3%	87074	55.3%	6656	4.2%	61671	39.2%	157422
Hisp/Latino (I)	98	3.4%	1546	53.6%	440	15.3%	799	27.7%	2883
Hisp/Latino (O)	124	3.3%	2444	65.2%	242	6.5%	941	25.1%	3751
Native Amer (I)	4	2.2%	103	57.2%	27	15.0%	46	25.6%	180
Native Amer (O)	9	4.6%	115	59.0%	10	5.1%	61	31.3%	195
Other (I)	10	1.5%	441	65.2%	73	10.8%	152	22.5%	676
Other (O)	7	1.0%	451	62.6%	40	5.6%	222	30.8%	720
TOTAL	3037	1.4%	123079	56.3%	15201	7.0%	77341	35.4%	218658

*cases where race, road type and outcome variables were all reported

APPENDIX B

SEARCHES CONDUCTED BY ROAD TYPE

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race & Road Type	Yes	% Yes	No	% No	Unknown	% Unknown	TOTAL
Afr Amer (I)	262	7.4%	3225	91.4%	41	1.2%	3528
Afr Amer (O)	192	7.0%	2506	91.6%	37	1.4%	2735
Afr Amer (U)	19	5.3%	328	90.9%	14	3.9%	361
Asian (I)	33	3.0%	1062	95.7%	15	1.4%	1110
Asian (O)	44	3.4%	1260	96.3%	5	0.4%	1309
Asian (U)	1	0.6%	156	98.1%	2	1.3%	159
Caucasian (I)	1614	3.4%	45402	95.6%	454	1.0%	47470
Caucasian (O)	4242	2.5%	163661	96.6%	1592	0.9%	169495
Caucasian (U)	314	2.4%	12527	94.1%	476	3.6%	13317
Hisp/Latino (I)	459	14.9%	2585	84.1%	29	0.9%	3073
Hisp/Latino (O)	288	7.0%	3779	92.1%	38	0.9%	4105
Hips/Latino (U)	46	8.6%	478	88.8%	14	2.6%	538
Native Amer (I)	8	4.1%	186	95.4%	1	0.5%	195
Native Amer (O)	16	7.4%	193	89.4%	7	3.2%	216
Native Amer (U)	4	8.2%	44	89.8%	1	2.0%	49
Other (I)	36	5.0%	681	93.9%	8	1.1%	725
Other (O)	18	2.4%	740	96.9%	6	0.8%	764
Other (U)	4	4.1%	91	92.9%	3	3.1%	98
Unknown (I)	43	3.7%	1112	94.9%	17	1.5%	1172
Unknown (O)	102	2.5%	3775	94.0%	138	3.4%	4015
Unknown (U)	46	0.7%	5917	88.8%	704	10.6%	6667
TOTAL	7791	3.0%	249708	95.6%	3602	1.4%	261101

Race & Road Type*	Yes	% Yes	No	% No	TOTAL
Afr Amer (I)	262	7.5%	3225	92.5%	3487
Afr Amer (O)	192	7.1%	2506	92.9%	2698
Asian (I)	33	3.0%	1062	97.0%	1095
Asian (O)	44	3.4%	1260	96.6%	1304
Caucasian (I)	1614	3.4%	45402	96.6%	47016
Caucasian (O)	4242	2.5%	163661	97.5%	167903
Hisp/Latino (I)	459	15.1%	2585	84.9%	3044
Hisp/Latino (O)	288	7.1%	3779	92.9%	4067
Native Amer (I)	8	4.1%	186	95.9%	194
Native Amer (O)	16	7.7%	193	92.3%	209
Other (I)	36	5.0%	681	95.0%	717
Other (O)	18	2.4%	740	97.6%	758
TOTAL	7212	3.1%	225280	96.9%	232492

*cases where race, road type and search variables were all reported

APPENDIX C (page 1 of 2) **TYPE OF SEARCH CONDUCTED BY RACE AND ROAD TYPE**

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race & Road Type	Arrest N	Arrest %	Consent N	Consent %	Officer Safety N	Officer Safety %	Probable Cause N	Probable Cause %	None N	None %	Unknown N	Unknown %	TOTAL
Afr Amer (I)	64	1.8%	107	3.0%	8	0.2%	83	2.4%	3225	91.4%	41	1.2%	3528
Afr Amer (O)	77	2.8%	47	1.7%	14	0.5%	54	2.0%	2506	91.6%	37	1.4%	2735
Afr Amer (U)	10	2.8%	6	1.7%	0	0.0%	3	0.8%	328	90.9%	14	3.9%	361
Total A.A.	151	2.3%	160	2.4%	22	0.3%	140	2.1%	6059	91.5%	92	1.4%	6624
Asian (I)	5	0.5%	20	1.8%	0	0.0%	8	0.7%	1062	95.7%	15	1.4%	1110
Asian (O)	17	1.3%	16	1.2%	4	0.3%	7	0.5%	1260	96.3%	5	0.4%	1309
Asian (U)	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	156	98.1%	2	1.3%	159
Total A.	22	0.9%	37	1.4%	4	0.2%	15	0.6%	2478	96.1%	22	0.9%	2578
Caucasian (I)	348	0.7%	707	1.5%	44	0.1%	515	1.1%	45402	95.6%	454	1.0%	47470
Caucasian (O)	1179	0.7%	1202	0.7%	309	0.2%	1552	0.9%	163661	96.6%	1592	0.9%	169495
Caucasian (U)	73	0.5%	121	0.9%	18	0.1%	102	0.8%	12527	94.1%	476	3.6%	13317
Total C.	1600	0.7%	2030	0.9%	371	0.2%	2169	0.9%	221590	96.2%	2522	1.1%	230282
Hisp/Latino (I)	68	2.2%	312	10.2%	13	0.4%	66	2.1%	2585	84.1%	29	0.9%	3073
Hisp/Latino (O)	96	2.3%	79	1.9%	19	0.5%	94	2.3%	3779	92.1%	38	0.9%	4105
Hisp/Latino (U)	7	1.3%	28	5.2%	1	0.2%	10	1.9%	478	88.8%	14	2.6%	538
Total H./L.	171	2.2%	419	5.4%	33	0.4%	170	2.2%	6842	88.7%	81	1.0%	7716
Native Amer (I)	1	0.5%	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	186	95.4%	1	0.5%	195
Native Amer (O)	7	3.2%	5	2.3%	0	0.0%	4	1.9%	193	89.4%	7	3.2%	216
Native Amer (U)	1	2.0%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	44	89.8%	1	2.0%	49
Total N.A.	9	2.0%	12	2.6%	0	0.0%	7	1.5%	423	92.0%	9	2.0%	460
Other (I)	2	0.3%	22	3.0%	0	0.0%	12	1.7%	681	93.9%	8	1.1%	725
Other (O)	3	0.4%	5	0.7%	0	0.0%	10	1.3%	740	96.9%	6	0.8%	764
Other (U)	1	1.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	91	92.9%	3	3.1%	98
Total O.	6	0.4%	29	1.8%	0	0.0%	23	1.4%	1512	95.3%	17	1.1%	1587
Unknown (I)	12	1.0%	17	1.5%	1	0.1%	13	1.1%	1112	94.9%	17	1.5%	1172
Unknown (O)	19	0.5%	39	1.0%	12	0.3%	32	0.8%	3775	94.0%	138	3.4%	4015
Unknown (U)	8	0.1%	17	0.3%	3	0.0%	18	0.3%	5917	88.8%	704	10.6%	6667
Total Unk.	39	0.3%	73	0.6%	16	0.1%	63	0.5%	10804	91.1%	859	7.2%	11854
TOTAL	1998	0.8%	2760	1.1%	446	0.2%	2587	1.0%	249708	95.6%	3206	1.4%	261101

APPENDIX C (page 2 of 2)

TYPE OF SEARCH CONDUCTED BY RACE AND ROAD TYPE

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race & Road Type*	Arrest		Consent		Officer Safety		Probable Cause		None		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Afr Amer (I)	64	1.8%	107	3.1%	8	0.2%	83	2.4%	3225	92.5%	3487
Afr Amer (O)	77	2.9%	47	1.7%	14	0.5%	54	2.0%	2506	92.9%	2698
Total A.A.	141	2.3%	154	2.5%	22	0.4%	137	2.2%	5731	92.7%	6185
Asian (I)	5	0.5%	20	1.8%	0	0.0%	8	0.7%	1062	97.0%	1095
Asian (O)	17	1.3%	16	1.2%	4	0.3%	7	0.5%	1260	96.6%	1304
Total A.	22	0.9%	36	1.5%	4	0.2%	15	0.6%	2322	96.8%	2399
Caucasian (I)	348	0.7%	707	1.5%	44	0.1%	515	1.1%	45402	96.6%	47016
Caucasian (O)	1179	0.7%	1202	0.7%	309	0.2%	1552	0.9%	163661	97.5%	167903
Total C.	1527	0.7%	1909	0.9%	353	0.2%	2067	1.0%	209063	97.3%	214919
Hisp/Latino (I)	68	2.2%	312	10.2%	13	0.4%	66	2.2%	2585	84.9%	3044
Hisp/Latino (O)	96	2.4%	79	1.9%	19	0.5%	94	2.3%	3779	92.9%	4067
Total H./L.	164	2.3%	391	5.5%	32	0.5%	160	2.3%	6364	89.5%	7111
Native Amer (I)	1	0.5%	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	186	95.9%	194
Native Amer (O)	7	3.3%	5	2.4%	0	0.0%	4	1.9%	193	92.3%	209
Total N.A.	8	2.0%	10	2.5%	0	0.0%	6	1.5%	379	94.0%	403
Other (I)	2	0.3%	22	3.1%	0	0.0%	12	1.7%	681	95.0%	717
Other (O)	3	0.4%	5	0.7%	0	0.0%	10	1.3%	740	97.6%	758
Total O.	5	0.3%	27	1.8%	0	0.0%	22	1.5%	1421	96.3%	1475
TOTAL	1867	0.8%	2527	1.1%	411	0.2%	2407	1.0%	225280	96.9%	232492

*cases where race, road type and search variables were all reported

Thomas J. Vilsack
Governor
Sally J. Pederson
Lt. Governor

Kevin W. Techau
Commissioner

April 29, 2003

Subject: Iowa State Patrol Traffic Stop Data Project

Thank you for your interest in the Iowa State Patrol Traffic Data Collection Project. We are eager to share these results with you and open the lines of communication for your feedback. I am proud of the job State Troopers perform across the state. I believe using this project as a tool to examine our experiences will provide potential improvements to enhance highway traffic safety. At the same time, I am interested in ensuring our officers have the ability to proactively seek criminal violators using Iowa's highway system.

The attached presentation is a synopsis of a briefing originally provided to several individuals/groups on April 29, 2003. The presentation represents my initial thoughts of the report prepared by Dick Moore, Director of the Iowa Division of Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning, (CJJP). This information is in no way an explanation of the results. Additionally, I did not make any attempt to draw conclusions regarding specific findings.

The Iowa State Patrol began this effort as a way to assess our public contacts during a time when the issue of racial profiling and collecting data was relatively new. In addition to learning details regarding our public contacts, I saw this project as an opportunity to improve service and community relations.

As we began to consider the details of this project, we consulted with faculty at Drake University in an effort to build a collection form and develop practices we believed would create an opportunity for a successful project. I am proud of this process based on the historical information available at that time.

My initial goals for the project were to improve our understanding of Trooper's public contacts and convey this information to our citizens. I believe through this process we will have a great opportunity to improve community relations. Additionally, I hoped to gain an understanding regarding how we could allocate our resources in the future.

Briefly, I would like to highlight a few tables within the report and offer my thoughts regarding the outcomes. In tables, 1-4 we learn the breakdown by race/ethnicity overall and by Iowa/Non-Iowa registered vehicles. Although using census data is not a direct indication of the motorists using Iowa's highway system, it is the only comprehensive norm available. I am encouraged by these results and look forward to your feedback and suggestions.

Table 7 and Appendix A highlight the outcomes of trooper's public contacts. As I examined this data, I became interested in the differences in outcome percentages when the roadway type was examined. For example, Latino motorists were least likely to receive a citation along Iowa's interstates and most likely to receive a citation on secondary roadways. In order to fully understand the reasons for the different outcome percentages by race/ethnicity, I believe we should have collected data related to the severity of the offense, warrants and traffic categories, (equipment, speed violations 1-10, 11-20 and above 21 m.p.h.)

Table 9 and Appendix C highlight searches conducted by troopers. My initial thought when I examined table 9 caused an immediate desire to look deeper at search type and roadway type to understand more of the variables related to the search data. The categories of officer safety and consent search were of particular interest. If a particular race/ethnic group had been searched for officer safety reasons at a significantly higher rate, I would have immediately become concerned. Each individual officer has wide discretion in determining when to utilize an officer safety search. The fact that few officer safety searches were performed is a positive sign.

Consent searches are requested following a traffic contact based on indicators observed by officers during the traffic stop. I have recently spoken with the Chief's of the Nebraska State Patrol and the Missouri State Highway Patrol regarding consent search issues. We plan to continue our conversations to evaluate the indicators used when determining when to request a search. The data clearly shows we must work to ensure our practices are fair and equitable for all motorists.

I have also attached several pages from my presentation outlining the Department of Public Safety's commitment to investigating complaints of racial profiling/bias based policing brought by motorists. This information includes an overview of complaints from October 2000 to present. I believe the frequency of complaints can serve as an evaluation tool in determining the successfulness of our policies and procedures.

Following the formal briefing on April 29, 2003, Commissioner of Public Safety Kevin W. Techau and I plan to meet with individuals and groups to determine their response and recommendations related to the report. Should you have questions or concerns, please contact me at (515) 281-5824 or by email garrison@dps.state.ia.us

Sincerely,

Col. Robert O. Garrison

Colonel Robert O. Garrison
Chief, Iowa State Patrol

International Association Chief's of Police Model To Eliminate Racial Profiling Within Police Agencies

Iowa State Patrol Policy and Practices

IACP Purpose Model Policies	Iowa State Patrol Guidelines and Practices
Unequivocally state that racial and ethnic profiling in law enforcement are unacceptable. • Provide guidelines for officers to prevent such an occurrence. • Protect officers when they act within the scope of law and policy.	Iowa State Patrol Policies and Procedures ,outline fair and equitable treatment for all persons. Memorandum, February 2000 strengthening prohibition of racial profiling
IACP- Departments efforts are directed toward assigning to those areas where there is a high likelihood that- • crashes will be reduced and/or • crime prevented through proactive patrol.	Iowa State Patrol directs patrols through the use of data provided by a number of sources.
IACP-Officers receive initial and ongoing training in proactive enforcement tactics including - • Officer Safety•Courtesy•Cultural Diversity• Search & Seizure • Interpersonal Communication	Iowa State Patrol requires each Trooper to attend a 20-week basic academy along with annual in-service training. This training includes the topics suggested by the IACP.
• IACP-Recommends utilizing verbal judo/communication techniques to interact with individual approaches. • "Training program will emphasize the need to respect the rights of all citizens to be free from unreasonable government intrusion or police action."	Iowa State Patrol troopers receive training in Verbal Judo and are required to practice the principles. Troopers receive annual training related to search and seizure as well as other State and Federal Judicial rulings.
IACP-Traffic enforcement accompanied by consistent, ongoing supervisory oversight to ensure officers do not go beyond parameters of reasonableness in conducting searches.	Iowa State Patrol continually monitor Troopers activities though supervisory ride-a-longs and review of their investigative reports.
IACP-Appropriates that enforcement action should always be completed, generally in the form of a warning, citation, or arrest.	Iowa State Patrol Troopers are given discretion in determining the appropriate enforcement action However, Troopers are instructed to issue a formal written warning or citation to document the contact.
IACP-If a police cruiser is equipped with a video camera, video and sound should be activated prior to the stop, and remain activated until the person is released.	Iowa State Patrol vehicles are equipped with in-car audio/visual recording equipment. Policies require the use of this equipment to record all contact with the motoring public.

Iowa State Patrol

Work Study

Data Collection Project

Colonel Robert O. Garrison

Table 1: Number of Stops by Race

Race	Total	
	N	%
African Amer	6624	2.5%
Asian	2578	1.0%
Caucasian	230282	88.2%
Hispanic/Latino	7716	3.0%
Native Amer	460	0.2%
Other	1587	0.6%
Unknown	11854	4.5%
Total	261101	100

Table 2: Cross Tabulation of Race by Place of Vehicle Registration

Race	Unknown		Iowa		Non-Iowa		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%*
African Amer	329	5.0	3276	49.5	3019	45.6	6624	100.1
Asian	154	6.0	1622	62.9	802	31.1	2578	100.0
Caucasian	9868	4.3	177424	77.1	42990	18.7	230282	100.1
Hispanic/Latino	448	5.8	4315	55.9	2953	38.3	7716	100.0
Native Amer	37	8.0	188	40.9	235	51.1	460	100.0
Other	96	6.1	822	51.8	669	42.2	1587	100.1
Unknown	6302	53.2	4540	38.3	1012	8.5	11854	100.0
Total	17234	6.6	192187	73.6	51680	19.8	261101	100.0

*May not total 100% due to rounding

Table 3: Cases Where Race and Registration Are Known, and Only Iowa Vehicles are Considered

RACE	% RACE CONTACTED	IA CENSUS POPULATION*
African American	1.7%	1.8%
Asian	0.9%	1.2%
Caucasian	94.6%	95.0%
Hispanic/Latino	2.3%	2.3%
Native American	0.1%	0.3%
Other	0.4%	1.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	102.3%

Note: Total population of Iowa residents 16 years of age or older. Census population exceeds 100% due to rounding and because the Hispanic/Latino population is calculated by the U.S. Census Bureau as a category separate from race.

Table 4: Cases Where Race and Registration Are Known, and Only Non-Iowa Vehicles are Considered

RACE	% RACE CONTACTED	U.S. CENSUS POPULATION*
African American	6.0%	11.5%
Asian	1.6%	3.7%
Caucasian	84.8%	77.1%
Hispanic/Latino	5.8%	11.1%
Native American	0.5%	0.8%
Other	1.3%	6.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	112.4%

Note: Estimate of total population of U.S. residents 16 years of age or older. Total population exceeds 100% because the Hispanic/Latino population is calculated by the U.S. Census Bureau as a category separate from race. "Other" includes multi-race persons among others.

Table 5: Cross Tabulation of Variables Race and Reason for Contact

Race	Unk		Pub Ast		Equip		Other		Pub Init		Com Sft		Traffic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Amer	388	5.9	535	8.1	440	6.6	81	1.2	49	0.7	2	<.1	5129	77.4
Asian	179	6.9	151	5.9	168	6.5	36	1.4	17	0.7	4	0.2	2023	78.5
Cauc	15301	6.6	9491	4.1	16854	7.3	2153	0.9	957	0.4	332	0.1	185194	80.4
Hisp/Latino	544	7.1	531	6.9	731	9.5	104	1.3	34	0.4	12	0.2	5760	74.7
Nat Amr	53	11.5	33	7.2	31	6.7	5	1.1	1	0.2	0	0.0	337	73.3
Other	97	6.1	70	4.4	124	7.8	23	1.4	13	0.8	3	0.2	1257	79.2
Unknown	6502	54.9	210	1.8	469	4.0	57	0.5	28	0.2	19	0.2	4569	38.5
Total	23064	8.8	11021	4.2	18817	7.2	2459	0.9	1099	0.4	372	0.1	204269	78.2

Table 7: Cross Tabulation of Variables Race and Contact Outcome

Race	Arrest		Citation		No Action		Warning		Unknown		TOTAL *	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Afr Amr	238	3.6	3747	56.6	723	10.9	1418	21.4	498	7.5	6624	100.0
Asian	28	1.1	1429	55.4	231	9.0	710	27.5	180	7.0	2578	100.0
Cauc	2674	1.2	119399	51.8	14018	6.1	77397	33.6	16794	7.3	230282	100.0
Hisp/Latino	241	3.1	4253	55.1	713	9.2	1881	24.4	628	8.1	7716	99.9
Nat Amr	15	3.3	241	52.4	38	8.3	122	26.5	44	9.6	460	100.1
Other	18	1.1	951	59.9	118	7.4	394	24.8	106	6.7	1587	99.9
Unknown	60	0.5	3473	29.3	366	3.1	2585	21.8	5370	45.3	11854	100.0
Total	3274	1.3	133493	51.1	16207	6.2	84507	32.4	23620	9.0	261101	100.0

* May not total 100% due to rounding

APPENDIX A **CONTACT OUTCOMES BY RACE AND BY ROAD TYPE**

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race &	**Arrest**		**Citation**		**No Action**		**Warning**		**Unknown**		**Total**
Road Type	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	
Afr Amer (I)	119	3.4%	2008	56.9%	496	14.1%	679	19.2%	226	6.4%	3528
Afr Amer (O)	111	4.1%	1541	56.3%	204	7.5%	667	24.4%	212	7.8%	2735
Afr Amer (U)	8	2.2%	198	54.8%	23	6.4%	72	19.9%	60	16.6%	361
Asian (I)	10	0.9%	659	59.4%	142	12.8%	244	22.0%	55	5.0%	1110
Asian (O)	18	1.4%	693	52.9%	85	6.5%	417	31.9%	96	7.3%	1309
Asian (U)	0	0.0%	77	48.4%	4	2.5%	49	30.8%	29	18.2%	159
Caucasian (I)	506	1.1%	26004	54.8%	6786	14.3%	11442	24.1%	2732	5.8%	47470
Caucasian (O)	2021	1.2%	87074	51.4%	6656	3.9%	61671	36.4%	12073	7.1%	169495
Caucasian (U)	147	1.1%	6321	47.5%	576	4.3%	4284	32.2%	1989	14.9%	13317
Hisp/Latino (I)	98	3.2%	1546	50.3%	440	14.3%	799	26.0%	190	6.2%	3073
Hisp/Latino (O)	124	3.0%	2444	59.5%	242	5.9%	941	22.9%	354	8.6%	4105
Hips/Latino (U)	19	3.5%	263	48.9%	31	5.8%	141	26.2%	84	15.6%	538
Native Amer (I)	4	2.1%	103	52.8%	27	13.8%	46	23.6%	15	7.7%	195
Native Amer (O)	9	4.2%	115	53.2%	10	4.6%	61	28.2%	21	9.7%	216
Native Amer (U)	2	4.1%	23	46.9%	1	2.0%	15	30.6%	8	16.3%	49
Other (I)	10	1.4%	441	60.8%	73	10.1%	152	21.0%	49	6.8%	725
Other (O)	7	0.9%	451	59.0%	40	5.2%	222	29.1%	44	5.8%	764
Other (U)	1	1.0%	59	60.2%	5	5.1%	20	20.4%	13	13.3%	98
Unknown (I)	10	0.9%	565	48.2%	147	12.5%	318	27.1%	132	11.3%	1172
Unknown (O)	32	0.8%	1905	47.4%	144	3.6%	1427	35.5%	507	12.6%	4015
Unknown (U)	18	0.3%	1003	15.0%	75	1.1%	840	12.6%	4731	71.0%	6667
TOTAL	3274	1.3%	133493	51.1%	16207	6.2%	84507	32.4%	23620	9.0%	261101

Table 9: Cross Tabulation of Searches Conducted by Race

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total *	
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
African Amer	473	7.1	6059	91.5	92	1.5	6624	100.1
Asian	78	3.0	2478	96.1	22	0.9	2578	100.0
Caucasian	6170	2.7	221590	96.2	2522	1.1	230282	100.0
Hispanic/Latino	793	10.3	6842	88.7	81	1.0	7716	100.0
Native Amer	28	6.0	423	92.0	9	2.0	460	100.0
Other	58	3.7	1512	95.3	17	1.0	1587	100.0
Unknown	191	1.6	10804	91.1	859	7.3	11854	100.0
Total	7791	3.0	249708	95.6	3602	1.4	261101	100

* May not total 100% because of rounding

APPENDIX C (page 1 of 2) **TYPE OF SEARCH CONDUCTED BY RACE AND ROAD TYPE**

(I = Interstate, O = Other, U = Unknown)

Race &	Arrest		Consent		Officer Safety		Probable Cause		None		Unknown		
Road Type	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Afr Amer (I)	64	1.8%	107	3.0%	8	0.2%	83	2.4%	3225	91.4%	41	1.2%	3528
Afr Amer (O)	77	2.8%	47	1.7%	14	0.5%	54	2.0%	2506	91.6%	37	1.4%	2735
Afr Amer (U)	10	2.8%	6	1.7%	0	0.0%	3	0.8%	328	90.9%	14	3.9%	361
Total A.A.	151	2.3%	160	2.4%	22	0.3%	140	2.1%	6059	91.5%	92	1.4%	6624
Asian (I)	5	0.5%	20	1.8%	0	0.0%	8	0.7%	1062	95.7%	15	1.4%	1110
Asian (O)	17	1.3%	16	1.2%	4	0.3%	7	0.5%	1260	96.3%	5	0.4%	1309
Asian (U)	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	156	98.1%	2	1.3%	159
Total A.	22	0.9%	37	1.4%	4	0.2%	15	0.6%	2478	96.1%	22	0.9%	2578
Caucasian (I)	348	0.7%	707	1.5%	44	0.1%	515	1.1%	45402	95.6%	454	1.0%	47470
Caucasian (O)	1179	0.7%	1202	0.7%	309	0.2%	1552	0.9%	163661	96.6%	1592	0.9%	169495
Caucasian (U)	73	0.5%	121	0.9%	18	0.1%	102	0.8%	12527	94.1%	476	3.6%	13317
Total C.	1600	0.7%	2030	0.9%	371	0.2%	2169	0.9%	221590	96.2%	2522	1.1%	230282
Hisp/Latino (I)	68	2.2%	312	10.2%	13	0.4%	66	2.1%	2585	84.1%	29	0.9%	3073
Hisp/Latino (O)	96	2.3%	79	1.9%	19	0.5%	94	2.3%	3779	92.1%	38	0.9%	4105
Hisp/Latino (U)	7	1.3%	28	5.2%	1	0.2%	10	1.9%	478	88.8%	14	2.6%	538
Total H./L.	171	2.2%	419	5.4%	33	0.4%	170	2.2%	6842	88.7%	81	1.0%	7716
Native Amer (I)	1	0.5%	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.0%	186	95.4%	1	0.5%	195
Native Amer (O)	7	3.2%	5	2.3%	0	0.0%	4	1.9%	193	89.4%	7	3.2%	216
Native Amer (U)	1	2.0%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	44	89.8%	1	2.0%	49
Total N.A.	9	2.0%	12	2.6%	0	0.0%	7	1.5%	423	92.0%	9	2.0%	460
Other (I)	2	0.3%	22	3.0%	0	0.0%	12	1.7%	681	93.9%	8	1.1%	725
Other (O)	3	0.4%	5	0.7%	0	0.0%	10	1.3%	740	96.9%	6	0.8%	764
Other (U)	1	1.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	91	92.9%	3	3.1%	98
Total O.	6	0.4%	29	1.8%	0	0.0%	23	1.4%	1512	95.3%	17	1.1%	1587
Unknown (I)	12	1.0%	17	1.5%	1	0.1%	13	1.1%	1112	94.9%	17	1.5%	1172
Unknown (O)	19	0.5%	39	1.0%	12	0.3%	32	0.8%	3775	94.0%	138	3.4%	4015
Unknown (U)	8	0.1%	17	0.3%	3	0.0%	18	0.3%	5917	88.8%	704	10.6%	6667
Total Unk.	39	0.3%	73	0.6%	16	0.1%	63	0.5%	10804	91.1%	859	7.2%	11854
TOTAL	1998	0.8%	2760	1.1%	446	0.2%	2587	1.0%	249708	95.6%	3206	1.4%	261101

Table 11: All Searches Conducted by Race and Contraband Found When Valid Values Were Present for Search and Contraband Found Variables

Race	Searched	Contraband Found	% Found Posses Contraband
African Amer	473	189	40.0
Asian	78	18	23.1
Caucasian	6170	2628	42.6
Hispanic/Latino	793	217	27.4
Native Amer	28	7	25.0
Other	58	15	25.9
Unknown	191	56	29.3
Total	7791	3130	40.2

- DPS Rule 5-1, Complaints and Investigations, (see insert)
- During this study 4 complaints brought by citizens involved race as an issue.
- Since study concluded, 1 additional complaint has been made.
- 5 complaints involving approximately 400,000 contacts with citizens.

- One involved an email blast, numerous emails sent to several DPS employees. Efforts to locate the sender for further investigation were unsuccessful.
- Another centered on the possibility a Trooper exhibited biased policing by issuing a citation for excessive dark windows to a minority driver. This trooper's citations were examined and found to contain no other citations to minority drivers for the same violation within the previous year. The Iowa Civil Rights Commission completed an independent investigation in this matter and determined that "race was not a factor in the stop"
- The remaining three were unsubstantiated. One of which was ultimately investigated by the State Ombudsman's office.

Iowa State Patrol
Work Study
Data Collection Project

Future Plans/Questions

Complaints and Investigations

The rules in this section present the procedures for initiating and receiving complaints and conducting investigations of complaints.

5-1 Complaints Against Officers

This rule establishes procedures for receiving and investigating complaints. A complaint is defined as an allegation by a fellow officer or a third party of a breach of rules by an officer.

A. Policy Regarding Complaints

The Department will accept and investigate all complaints of misconduct promptly and fairly. It will also ensure that proper discipline is maintained by management.

B. When to Initiate a Complaint

You are required to immediately make a complaint to the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) in any of the following situations:

1. If you witness another officer acting in a way that may involve criminal offense, misconduct, or any violations of rules or orders

2. If you witness another officer acting in a way that may violate a citizen's rights

3. If you witness another officer using unnecessary or excessive force

4. If another officer's firearm is discharged, unless for the purpose of training, qualifications, or the necessary destruction of animals

C. Accepting a Complaint

A complaint may be accepted by the Professional Standards Bureau or by any officer.

The following procedures apply when you accept a complaint from a citizen about another officer or initiate a complaint yourself:

1. You will immediately record as much information about the complaint as possible. Do not dispose of this information until a supervisor gives you approval to do so.

2. If you understand the complaint and know that the complainant does not have enough information about the situation or Departmental policy, you may explain a Departmental policy or procedure or the action complained about.

3. If the complaint is about a law the Department must enforce or is a matter the Department has no jurisdiction over or cannot change, you may explain this and refer the complainant to a person or agency that can respond to the complaint.

4. You must never discourage a person from lodging a complaint.

5. Anonymous complaints are to be accepted and investigated in the same way as all other complaints.

6. You may tell the complainant that the complaint will be investigated.

7. Immediately after receiving the complaint, type or have typed a report on the Allegation of Employee Misconduct form. This report is to be distributed as follows:
   a. Send the original, along with all original correspondence, directly to:
      Professional Standards Bureau
      Department of Public Safety
      Wallace Building
      Des Moines, Iowa 50319
   b. If you have the same immediate supervisor as the officer complained against, send a copy of the misconduct report to the immediate supervisor.
   c. If you do not have the same immediate supervisor as the officer complained against, send a copy and original of the report to PSB.

8. Divisions may require distribution of additional copies of the misconduct report.

9. Anyone receiving a copy of the misconduct report must be informed of the disposition of the complaint, especially if it is an exoneration. Upon exoneration, all extra copies of the report must be destroyed.

10. All complaints other than complaints against officers will be recorded and forwarded to the Division Director on a form and in a manner specified by the Director.

Resource Guide

International Chief's of Police, Division of State and Provincial Police,
Division Director Dave Tollett
515 North Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314-2357
(703)836-6767

"A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data "Collection Systems – Promising Practices and Lessons Learned" was issued by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2000 (http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/bja/184768.pdf).

"How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data: Your Reputation Depends on it!" was issued by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services in 2002 (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Open=True&Item=770).

"Characteristics of Drivers Stopped by Police, 1999" issued March 2002 by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. . http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cdsp99.htm

"Traffic Stop Data Collection Policies for State Police, 2001" http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/tsdcp01.htm

"Racially Biased Policing: A Principled Response" http://www.policeforum.org/racial.html

Online copy of CJJP report along with Colonel Robert O. Garrison's initial thoughts upon release. www.iowastatepatrol.org

Kevin W. Techau, Commissioner of Public Safety (515) 281-5261 or techau@dps.state.ia.us

Colonel Robert O. Garrison, Chief Iowa State Patrol (515)281-5824 or garrison@dps.state.ia.us

Lieutenant Robert Hansen, DPS, Public Information Officer (515)281-5615 or rhansen@dps.state.is.us